

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/937,647	01/29/2002	Michael Rosenthal	041165/9023	2467	
7590 10/12/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Timothy M Kelley Michael Best & Friedrich			MULCAHY, PETER D		
100 East Wisco	nsin Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108		*	1713		
			DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004	,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/937,647	ROSENTHAL ET AL.
omee reason cammary	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Peter D. Mulcahy	1713
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication.
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	28 July 2004	•
_	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all		ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		,
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-23 and 27-31</u> is/are pending i	n the application	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	idiawii iioiii consideratioii.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-23 and 27-31</u> is/are rejected.		•
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or cloation requiremant	
	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		·
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) ☐ objected to b	y the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	rrection is required if the drawing(s	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ients have been received in Ap	plication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been re	eceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bu		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.
Attachment(s)		•
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sur	mmary (PTO-413)
2)	Paper No(s)/I	Mail Date
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	/08) 5) ☐ Notice of Info	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

The rejection as set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is herein withdrawn. Applicants' amendments have obviated this rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-23 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ejk, U.S. Patent 4,132,691 taken alone or further in view of Sugahara et al., U.S. Patent 4,060,508.

The rejection as set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in the paper mailed March 22, 2004 is deemed proper and is herein repeated.

Applicants' remarks have been fully considered but have been deemed to be not persuasive.

With respect to the Ejk patent, applicants argue that the zinc oxide and/or zinc hydroxide are less preferred given the undesirable interaction between the zinc and the lubricant composition. Case law has well established that mentioned disadvantages do not properly constitute grounds for

patentability. See In re Boe 148 USPQ 507. The more germane portions of the disclosure are those where the zinc salt is disclosed as being a stabilizer to be utilized in combination with both the tin and calcium compounds. Applicants address this rejection by arguing that the disclosure of Ejk does not contain any hint that zinc salts can be combined with organotin compounds identified as the heat stabilizers. This is not persuasive. Examiner maintains that Ejk does teach the compounds functioning in an advantageous manner when mixed into the vinyl chloride resin compositions. It is prima facie obvious to combine ingredients and have them function in an expected manner. each of the compounds is specifically identified as being desirable and one of ordinary skill in the art would find it prima facie obvious to use them in combination with one another and have them function in an expected manner. The adverse effects of the zinc as mentioned by applicants has no bearing on the obviousness of combining the zinc salt with the tin stabilizer. The Ejk patent is clear as to the functionality of both the zinc salt and tin compound.

In addressing the combination rejection, applicants argue that the Sugahara patent shows the zinc salts to be the least effective stabilizers when incorporated into the composition. This argument does not render the instantly claimed invention

patentable over the combination of these references. Once again, the mentioned disadvantages of the compound do not negate its obviousness and applicants have failed to show that the instantly claimed composition is any more effective in stabilizing the vinyl halide resin compositions than that of the prior art. The courts have well established that it is prima facie obvious to combine known ingredients and have them function in an expected manner. In re Linder, 173 USPQ 356.

Applicants then identify claims 30 and 31 as being allowable over the prior art for the same reasons as claim 14 is considered allowable and additionally for the recitation of the specific zinc compounds to be selected. The limitations of claims 30 and 31 are not considered to be patentable over the prior art. The zinc salts of saturated aliphatic carboxylic acids having from 10 to 18 carbon atoms are seen to be expressly disclosed within each of the patents where the carboxylic acids are identified. Furthermore the zinc oxide and hydroxide are considered to be rendered prima facie obvious by Ejk for the reasons as advanced supra.

The limitations of claims 15-23 and 27-29 have not been specifically argued by applicants. The preferred amounts, species or properties as identified in these claims are considered to be either anticipated or rendered prima facie

obvious for the reasons as advanced in the prior Office action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached during regular business hours.

The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

Art Unit 1713

obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P. Mulcahy:cdc October 8, 2004

PETER D. MULCAHY
PRIMARY EXAMINER